

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/812,273	VOLD ET AL.	
	Examiner Jennifer H. Gay	Art Unit 3672	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Jennifer H. Gay (3) _____

(2) Randol W. Read (4) _____

Date of Interview: 16 December 2006.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference

c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: Attachment A.

Claim(s) discussed: 7.

Identification of prior art discussed: Tilton et al (US 2003/0085815).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



Jennifer H. Gay
Primary Examiner

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an
Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant contacted the examiner to discuss a purposed amendment to claim 7 to place the case in condition for allowance. The suggested change was to indicate that the blocking member was axially displaced by the stinger. A review of the reference with regards to the change indicated that this change would place claim 7, and thus the case, in condition for allowance. The examiner agreed to make the change in an examiner's amendment. As the interview resulted in the allowance of the application, applicant is not required to submit a summary of this interview..

Attachment A.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT

We propose amending independent claim 7 to read, "...axially displacing a blocking member with the stinger, wherein the blocking member [[that]] prevents alignment of the first ends of the upper and lower instrumentation lines, to align the first end of the upper instrumentation line with the first end of the lower instrumentation line..." No new material is introduced by this proposed amendment.

PROPOSED REMARKS

Regarding the final office action dated October 24, 2006, we would like to argue that *Tilton et al.* (US Published Patent Appl. No. 2003/0085814) does not teach "axially displacing a blocking member with the stinger, wherein the blocking member prevents alignment of the first ends of the upper and lower instrumentation lines" as recited in independent claim 7.

If the Examiner is considering the arm 240 of *Tilton* as a "blocking member," then the "blocking member" of *Tilton* does not prevent alignment of the first ends of the upper and lower instrumentation lines; nor is the arm 240 axially displaced with a stinger. Rather, the arm 240 "is held inside a recess 250 in the hanger 180 by the wall of the casing 110" (para. [0060] lines 16-17 and FIG. 10). Without the casing 110, the arm 240 would always be "biased in an outward direction" (para. [0060] line 8), thereby allowing for alignment of the ends; thus, the arm 240 is not a blocking member that prevents alignment of the ends of the instrumentation lines. Although the wall of the casing 110 in *Tilton* may prevent alignment of the ends, the casing 110 is not axially displaced and certainly not with a stinger.

The Examiner's attention is drawn to Figs. 6A, 6B, and 8 and paragraph [0038] of the present application in which an example of a blocking member is discussed. "[A]xial movement of the stinger 300 transfers to the debris sleeve 250 in the landing tool 200 and shifts the debris sleeve 250 downward in order to

expose the pocket 218 in the offset mandrel 210. As shown in the intermediate position, a small portion of the debris sleeve 250 adjacent the lower end of the window 256 continues to block outward movement of the connector guide 278 and housed upper connector 270 of the landing tool 200."

We will call to discuss these remarks with you tomorrow, December 19, 2006 at the agreed upon time of 9:00 a.m. (EST).

Randol W. Read
Registration No. 43876
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicants

**PATTERSON &
SHERIDAN, LLP**
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

3040 Post Oak Blvd, Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056-6582
TEL 713.623.4844
FAX 713.623.4846

FACSIMILE COVER SHEET

DATE: December 18, 2006
FILE NO: WEAT/0345
TO: Examiner Jennifer H. Gay
FAX NO: 571.273.7029
PHONE NO: 571.272.7209
COMPANY: USPTO
FROM: Randol Read
PAGE(S) with cover: 3
ORIGINAL TO FOLLOW? YES NO

PROPOSED AMENDMENT

TITLE: Apparatus and Methods for Installing Instrumentation Line in a Wellbore
U.S. SERIAL NO.: 10/812,273
FILING DATE: 3/29/04
INVENTOR: Vold et al.
EXAMINER: Jennifer H. Gay
GROUP ART UNIT: 3672
CONFIRMATION NO.: 2274

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE

The document accompanying this facsimile transmission contains information from the law firm of Patterson & Sheridan, L.L.P. which is confidential or privileged. The information is intended to be for the use of the individual or entity named on this transmission sheet. If you are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the contents of this faxed information is prohibited. If you have received this facsimile in error, please notify us by telephone immediately so that we can arrange for the retrieval of the original documents at no cost to you.

528343_1.DOC